

REMARKS

Claims 20-44 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 16-19 are rejected. Claims 1-19 are objected to. Claims 1-19 are cancelled herein. New claims 20-44 are added. A new set of claims is provided to address the Examiner's concerns.

The specification and abstract have been objected to as having problems of grammar and idiomatic English. The Office Action has requested that a substitute specification be submitted and that the abstract be corrected. Also, the Office Action has objected to the phraseology "hurting plant matter", "painting" by pressing plant matter, and the pigment "is flown out" after pressing. A substitute specification and abstract are provided herewith to address the Examiner's concerns. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-19 have been objected to. The Examiner has requested that the claims be re-written using proper idiomatic English for clarity and understanding. Furthermore, the Examiner has pointed out other problems with the claims, as described below.

In claims 1, 11, 16-19, the Office Action states that the meaning of "canvas for a dyed drawing which is drawn the dyed drawing" is confusing. The Office Action states that in claim 2, the last three lines are unclear. The Office Action states that in claim 5, the meaning of "providing to a back...canvas body" is confusing. The Office Action states that in claim 6, lines 2 and 4 are confusing.

The Office Action states that in claim 9, the meaning of lines 3-4 is unclear. The Office Action states that the meaning of lines 3-6 is unclear but does not state which claim this refers to. The Office Action states that in claim 11, the intended limitation of the "after-treating" step is unclear. The Office Action states that in claims 17 and 19, the last 2 lines are confusing.

A new set of claims has been provided to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 16-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The Office Action states that claims 4 and 5 are vague because the term "tiny" is ambiguous and not defined by the specification. The Office Action states that claim 5 is indefinite because the term "seldom" on line 5 does not convey the intended absorption of water and is not defined by the specification. The Office Action states that claim 8 is indefinite because "of the kind of synthetic material" does not distinctly convey the intended material. The Office Action states that claim 10 is vague because "thin" does not convey the intended thickness and is not defined in the specification. The Office Action states that in claims 1, 11, and 16-19, "the dyed drawing" lacks antecedent basis. The Office Action states that the "painting" step is vague because no step appears to be required.

A new set of claims has been provided to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Office Action suggests that the claimed process distinguishes over the prior art if the above-identified issues are addressed. Since the above-identified

issues have been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests that all the claims be allowed.

New claims 20-44 have been added and support for the new claims can be found in, for example, the claims as filed.

Six further claims in excess of twenty are added. **The fee of \$150.00 for the claims is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of \$60.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

B and,

By Ricardo Unikel
Ricardo Unikel
Reg. No. 52,309
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038